

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 5 is amended, and claims 7-14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants thank Examiner Lee for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the April 11, 2007 personal interview. During the interview, it was agreed that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied prior art. Specific subject matter discussed during the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

A. The Office Action objects to claim 5, as being of improper dependent form. In accordance with discussions during the interview, claim 5 has been amended to recite, additionally, "the reference database being machine-readable." Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 3. Claim 3 is not rewritten in independent form at this time, because claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied prior art as discussed below.

C. The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. 2003/0009293 (Anderson), and rejects claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. 2003/0157504 (Chee). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As explained during the interview, neither Anderson nor Chee discloses "training samples" as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the training samples of claim 1 correlate a reference spectrum with a corresponding plurality of normalized illuminants sensor outputs for reference colors. While the references might teach or suggest analyzing unknown samples by using spectra, there is simply no teaching or suggestion of analyzing training samples that correlate reference spectra with normalized sensor outputs for reference colors. See, e.g., paragraph [0040] of the specification for a description of an example of normalization.

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, it appears that the references describe that "clusters" emerge and are identified as samples are added to the database. This is different from what is recited in claim 1, in which clusters are established, and the most appropriate one of the clusters is identified for each training sample, and the training sample is assigned to that most appropriate cluster.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

* * *

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JAN/scg

Attachment:
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: April 16, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--